

**Draft Summary of the Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
April 26, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Engineering and Operations Work Group on April 26, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary of the discussion for information purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting. The meeting objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Flip Chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – April 5, 2001 Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting

A summary of the April 5, 2001 Engineering and Operations Work Group is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from the April 5, 2001 Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting as follows:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Action Item #EO8
Status: | DWR staff to investigate posting storage projections on the relicensing web site. Staff is currently developing a template for posting the storage projections. The information will be provisional and subject to revision. DWR is determining if the information will be a stand alone posting on the relicensing web site, or a link to the State Water Project Operations Control Office's web site. The template should be done within 10 days. |
| Action Item #EO9
Status: | Lake Oroville sedimentation update – information from past studies. Copies of the 1993 and 1994 sedimentation study were available for review at the meeting. Individuals can get copies from DWR upon request. Approximately 18,000 acre-feet of sediment had been measured or about 0.5 percent of the volume of the reservoir. The study will be placed in the Public Reference File. |
| Action Item #EO10
Status: | Provide a brief explanation of power operations related to power generation and pumping requirements for State Water Project facilities. The presentation is being prepared and will be delivered to the Plenary Group at its May 1, 2001 meeting. The Engineering and Operations Work Group will see the presentation at its May 25, 2001 meeting. |
| Action Item #EO11
Status: | Make sure FERC's latest review of the Oroville Facilities is in the Public Reference File (Part 12). DWR is still looking into the Part 12 review. Staff will report back to the Work Group at their next meeting. |
| Action Item #EO12
Status: | Revise Issue Statements and circulate to Work Group. A review of the revised Issue Statements is part of this agenda. |
| Action Item #EO13
Status: | Develop draft Issue Sheets for two Issue Statements for Work Group review and discussion at their next meeting. A review of two sample Issue Sheets is part of this agenda. |

Development of Issue Statements

At the April 5, 2001 Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting, the consulting team was assigned to revise Issue Statements. Wayne Dyok of the consulting team described the Issue Statement revision process. He explained that DWR staff provided additional revisions to the Issue Statements subsequent to the Engineering and Operations Work Group's April 5, 2001 revisions. The Work Group reviewed its suggested changes and the revisions suggested by DWR. Wayne explained that DWR staff agreed with the revised Issue Statements developed by the Work Group, but had suggested bifurcating Issue Statement 3 into two separate statements. One statement would emphasize coordinating overall operations with other facilities and resource agencies. The second would focus on modeling different flow regimes at the Oroville Facilities to determine environmental and economic impacts. DWR also added a statement to the end of the Issue Statement list indicating which issues had been transferred to the Environmental Work Group or required no further evaluation. The Work Group's revised Issue Statements are appended to this summary as Attachment 4.

- ◆ Bill Lewis representing Yuba County suggested that a reference to State drinking water standards be added to Issue Statement 13. The statement was altered to reflect this comment.

The revised Issue Statements with changes suggested by DWR were distributed to the Engineering and Operations Work Group and are appended to this summary as Attachment 5. The Engineering and Operations Work Group reviewed the revised statements and provided the following comments.

- ◆ Change Issue Statement 3 to read, "Evaluate potential for improved coordinated operation of Oroville Facilities with other water storage facilities and regulatory and resource agencies (e.g. CAL-FED) (5 and 6)."
- ◆ Change Issue Statement 4 to read, "to evaluate environmental and economic aspects of different flow regimes through the use of support system models as a tool (see Issue E2 above). Factors to be considered include timing, magnitude and duration of flows, pump back and maintenance scheduling, and hatchery operations (4, 7, 8, 13, 25, 26 28, 32 and 33)."
- ◆ Change Issue Statement 6 to read, "Effect of ramping rates on downstream facilities, power generation, water supply, water temperatures, and fish (10)."
- ◆ Bill Lewis's comment on the first set of revised issue statements was carried forward.
- ◆ Ken Kules of the Metropolitan Water District asked if any special studies were being considered given the unusually low water level in the reservoir. He specifically mentioned aerial photography studies. The Facilitator mentioned that both the Environmental and Cultural Resources Work Groups were considering low water studies, and the Engineering and Operations Work Group might also want to consider taking advantage of the current conditions. Ralph Torres of DWR agreed to identify potential early studies.

The Work Group agreed to recommend the revised list of Issue Statements to the Plenary Group for inclusion into Scoping Document I.

Issue Sheets

For each Issue Statement, an Issue Sheet is developed by the Work Group to identify resource goals, information available, additional study needs relative to that issue and to determine study scope. Each Issue Sheet will be used to develop study plans.

At its previous meeting the Engineering and Operations Work Group agreed to focus on finishing Issue Statements for the Scoping Document. The Work Group tasked the consulting team with

developing Issue Sheets for two Issue Statements for review at this meeting. Issue Sheets for Issue Statements 3 and 4 were distributed to the Work Group and are appended to this Summary as Attachment 6.

Wayne Dyok outlined the elements of an Issue Sheet: (1) Issue Statement, (2) Resource Goals, (3) Existing Information, (4) Information Needs, and (5) Geographic Scope. Wayne mentioned that the Environmental Work Group suggested considering geographic scope before trying to determine resource goals. Wayne suggested Engineering and Operations Work Group participants access FERC's web site and download a copy of the Interagency Task Force Report regarding the hydropower licensing process and review the description of Issue Sheet development. The FERC web site is included in the Flip-Chart Notes in Attachment 3.

The Work Group reviewed the example Issue Sheets and provided comments. A complete list of comments on the example Issue Sheets can be found as part of the Flip-Chart Notes in Attachment 3.

- ◆ The Work Group asked if the existing hydrodynamic models used by DWR for operating the Oroville Facilities would be adequate for the study phase of the relicensing model. Curtis Creel of DWR responded that the models were being evaluated and that it was likely that additional modeling resources would be required for the studies. He felt an approach utilizing several different models providing different pieces of information would be needed.
- ◆ The Work Group discussed flood protocols and DWR's operation of the Oroville Facilities in conjunction with other facilities along the tributaries of the Sacramento River. The Work Group discussed the scope of flood control studies and decisions made at Oroville that impact downstream flood dynamics. Curtis Creel explained that current flood control protocols include coordination with Sacramento County. The Work Group requested that DWR provide information regarding flood control protocols at the facility, including how protocols are updated with new technologies and flood information.
- ◆ One participant asked for a graphic model of water supply and power generating capabilities within California with information relative to where water and power from Northern California are delivered. DWR indicated they would check with the Office of Water Education for appropriate resources.

The Engineering and Operations Work Group assigned the consulting team to develop Issue Sheets for the remaining Issue Statements for review at the May 25, 2001 Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting.

Next Meeting

The Work Group agreed to meet on:

Date: Friday, May 25, 2001
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Location: Oroville Field Division

Agreements Made

1. The Work Group agreed to recommend the approved list of Issue Statements to the Plenary Group for inclusion in Scoping Document I.
2. The Work Group agreed to review draft Issue Sheets developed by the consulting team at the May 25, 2001 meeting.
3. The Work Group agreed to meet again on May 25, 2001 from 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the Oroville Field Division.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Engineering and Operations Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #EO14: Presentation on flood management program.

Responsible: DWR staff

Due Date: May 25, 2001
5, 2001

Action Item #EO15: Presentation on Power Economics (repeat from Plenary Group)

Responsible: DWR staff

Due Date: May 25, 2001

Action Item #EO16: Develop and distribute draft Issue Sheets for Work Group review and comment at their next meeting.

Responsible: Consulting Team

Due Date: May 18, 2001

Action Item #EO17: Provide a graphic model of water supply and power generating capabilities within California with information relative to where water and power from Northern California are delivered.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: May 18, 2001